

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

PACKET INTELLIGENCE LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 2:14-cv-00252-JRG

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

ORDER REGARDING E-DISCOVERY

The Court hereby GRANTS the Parties Joint Motion for Entry of Order Regarding E-Discovery (Dkt. no. 51) as follows:

1. This order supplements all other discovery rules and orders. It streamlines Electronically Stored Information (“ESI”) production to promote a “just, speedy, and inexpensive determination” of this action, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1.
2. This order may be modified in the court’s discretion or by agreement of the parties. The parties shall jointly submit any proposed modifications within 30 days after the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16 conference. If the parties cannot resolve their disagreements regarding these modifications, the parties shall submit their competing proposals and a summary of their dispute.
3. A party’s meaningful compliance with this order and efforts to promote efficiency and reduce costs will be considered in cost-shifting determinations.
4. Absent a showing of good cause, general ESI production requests under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 34 and 45, or compliance with a mandatory disclosure requirement of this Court, shall include only the metadata identified in the Discovery Order for the production of

documents originating in electronic format, and only if that metadata is electronically available and reasonably accessible to the producing party.

5. Absent agreement of the parties or further order of this court, the following parameters shall apply to ESI production:

A. General Document Image Format.

- i. Each electronic document shall be produced in single-page Tagged Image File Format (“TIFF”) format. TIFF files shall be single page and shall be named with a unique production number followed by the appropriate file extension. Load files shall be provided to indicate the location and unitization of the TIFF files. If a document is more than one page, the unitization of the document and any attachments and/or affixed notes shall be maintained as they existed in the original document.
- ii. The parties may also or alternatively produce documents originating in electronic format (including but not limited to Excel files, .txt files, and media files) in native format labeled with a unique production number and appropriate confidentiality designation, if any, in the file name or on the disks, hard drives, or other media containing such electronic files. However, the receiving party must reasonably, and without unduly burdensome measures by the producing party, be able to open and review any documents produced solely in native format.

B. Text-Searchable Documents. No party has an obligation to make its production text-searchable; however, if a party’s documents already exist in text-searchable format independent of this litigation, or are converted to text-searchable format for use in this

litigation, including for use by the producing party's counsel, then such documents shall be produced in the same text-searchable format at no cost to the receiving party.

C. **Footer.** Each document image produced in TIFF format shall contain a footer with a sequentially ascending production number.

D. **Native Files.** A party that receives a document produced in TIFF format may make a reasonable request to receive the document in its native format, and upon receipt of such a request, the producing party shall produce the document in its native format.

E. **No Backup Restoration Required.** Absent a showing of good cause, no party need restore any form of media upon which backup data is maintained in a party's normal or allowed processes, including but not limited to backup tapes, disks, SAN, and other forms of media, to comply with its discovery obligations in the present case.

F. **Voicemail and Mobile Devices.** Absent a showing of good cause, voicemails, PDAs and mobile phones are deemed not reasonably accessible and need not be collected and preserved.

6. General ESI production requests under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 34 and 45, or compliance with a mandatory disclosure order of this court, shall not include e-mail or other forms of electronic correspondence (collectively "e-mail"). To obtain e-mail parties must propound specific e-mail production requests.

7. E-mail production requests shall be phased to occur timely after the parties have exchanged initial disclosures, a specific listing of likely e-mail custodians, a specific identification of the twenty (20) most significant listed e-mail custodians in view of the pleaded claims and defenses,¹ infringement contentions and accompanying documents pursuant to P.R. 3-

¹ A "specific identification" requires a short description of why the custodian is believed to be significant.

1 and 3-2, invalidity contentions and accompanying documents pursuant to P.R. 3-3 and 3-4, and preliminary information relevant to damages. The exchange of this information shall occur at the time required under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Local Rules, or by order of the court. Each requesting party may also propound up to five written discovery requests and take one deposition per producing party to identify the proper custodians, proper search terms, and proper time frame for e-mail production requests. The court may allow additional discovery upon a showing of good cause.

8. E-mail production requests shall identify the custodian, search terms, and time frame. The parties shall cooperate to identify the proper custodians, proper search terms, and proper time frame. Each requesting party shall limit its e-mail production requests to a total of twelve (12) custodians per producing party for all such requests. The parties may jointly agree to modify this limit without the court's leave. The court shall consider contested requests for additional or fewer custodians per producing party, upon showing a distinct need based on the size, complexity, and issues of this specific case.

9. Each requesting party shall limit its e-mail production requests to a total of fifteen (15) search terms per custodian per party. The parties may jointly agree to modify this limit without the court's leave. The court shall consider contested requests for additional or fewer search terms per custodian, upon showing a distinct need based on the size, complexity, and issues of this specific case. The search terms shall be narrowly tailored to particular issues. Indiscriminate terms, such as the producing company's name or its product name, are inappropriate unless combined with narrowing search criteria that sufficiently reduce the risk of overproduction. A conjunctive combination of multiple words or phrases (e.g., "computer" and "system") narrows the search and shall count as a single search term. A disjunctive combination


of multiple words or phrases (e.g., “computer” or “system”) broadens the search, and thus each word or phrase shall count as a separate search term unless they are variants of the same word.² Use of narrowing search criteria (e.g., “and,” “but not,” “w/x”) is encouraged to limit the production and shall be considered when determining whether to shift costs for disproportionate discovery.

10. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d), the inadvertent production of a privileged or work product protected ESI is not a waiver in the pending case or in any other federal or state proceeding.

11. The mere production of ESI in a litigation as part of a mass production shall not itself constitute a waiver for any purpose.

12. Except as expressly stated, nothing in this order affects the parties’ discovery obligations under the Federal or Local Rules.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 8th day of October, 2014.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

² Variants of an accused product name or component name shall be considered variants of the same word.